IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.258 OF 2003

OFFICE NOTES, OFFICE MEMORANDUM OF CORAM, APPEARANCES, COURT'S ORDERS OR DIRECTIONS AND REGISTRAR'S ORDERS	COURT'S OR JUDGES ORDERS

Shri A.S.Shitole, A.P.P for the Appellant.
Shri Ajay S. Patil for the Respondent No.2.

CORAM : A. S. OKA, J.
DATE : DECEMBER 21, 2006.

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned A.P.P for the State and the learned Advocate for the second Respondent. The first Respondent is dead. The first Respondent was the husband of the complainant. The second Respondent is her father-in-law. The acquittal of the second Respondent is for offence under section 498A read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. The learned Judge has considered the evidence of all prosecution witnesses. The learned Judge has disbelieved the case of the prosecution regarding demand made by the accused persons on the ground that the version of the witnesses was totally different on the material aspects of alleged demand and illtreatment. I find that there is a hardly

any material on record as against the second Respondent. The first Respondent-husband has already expired. The view taken by the learned Trial Judge is a possible view. No case is made out for grant of leave. Appeal is rejected.

JUDGE